

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 6,324,335, issued to Kanda et al. (“Kanda”). The Examiner rejected claims 25, 26, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda in view of U.S. Patent Publication number 2003/0016254 by Abe et al. (“Abe”). The Examiner rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda in view of Abe in further view of U.S. Patent number 5,999,173 issued to Ubillos et al. (Ubillos). The Examiner has objected to claims 27-29 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but has said that they would be patentable if rewritten in independent form.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 9-14, 16, 19-23, 25, 28, 29 and 32. Applicant does not surrender any equivalents of any amended elements or limitations. Applicant has added claims 33-67. Applicant has not canceled any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-67 will be pending after entry of these Amendments.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 22-32 UNDER § 112, 2nd paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action states that the recitation of “the other axis” (found in claims 22) is indefinite as the claim recites “at least two axes”. The Office Action states that claim 24 recites the limitation “content-time axis” and that this limitation is without antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 22 to recite “at least a playback time axis... and a content time axis” rather than “at least two axes...the other axis”. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejections of claims 22-24 be withdrawn.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Kanda. Claims 2-13 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the reasons specified below with regard to claim 1. Claim 1, recites a method of specifying speed effects for playing a video clip. The method receives a set of speed effects for the video clip through a set of modifications of a user selectable graph that represents a playback-time in relation to a content-time of the video clip. The method displays, in real-time, a presentation of the video clip that accounts for the set of speed effects defined for the video clip.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kanda does not anticipate claim 1 because it does not provide every element of claim 1. For example, Kanda does not disclose, teach, or even suggest a graph that represents a playback-time in relation to a content-time of a video clip, as claim 1 recites. The Office Action (in regard to claim 5) points to Kanda, Figure 13, item 25, as providing a graph representing the playback speed of the video clip. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the identified item is a graph representing playback speed. In fact, Kanda itself refers to item 25 as an area, not a graph. However, in any case, neither the identified item nor anything else in Kanda discloses, teaches, or even suggests a playback-time in relation to a content-time, as claim 1 recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanda does not anticipate claim 1. As claims 2-13 are dependent, directly or indirectly on claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-13 are patentable over Kanda for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejections of claims 1-13.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-19 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Kanda. Claims 15-19 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 14, and are thus patentable for at least the reasons specified below with regard to claim 14. Claim 14, recites a computer readable medium that stores a computer program for specifying speed effects for playing a video clip. The computer program is executable on one or more processors. The computer program comprising sets of instructions for: (1) defining a set of speed effects for the video clip, (2) displaying in real-time a presentation of the video clip that accounts for the set of speed effects defined for the video clip, and (3) providing a graph that represents a playback-time in relation to a content-time of the video clip.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kanda does not anticipate claim 14 because it does not provide every element of claim 14. For example, Kanda does not disclose, teach, or even suggest a graph that represents a playback-time in relation to a content-time of a video clip, as claim 14 recites. The Office Action (in regard to claim 5) points to Kanda, Figure 13, item 25, as providing a graph representing the playback speed of the video clip. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the identified item is a graph representing playback speed. In fact, Kanda itself refers to item 25 as an area, not a graph. However, in any case, neither the identified item nor anything else in Kanda discloses, teaches, or even suggests a playback-time in relation to a content-time, as claim 14 recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanda does not anticipate claim 14. As claims 15-19 are dependent, directly or indirectly on claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-19 are patentable over Kanda for at least the same reasons that claim 14 is. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejections of claims 14-19.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 20-32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) & 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20-24 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Kanda. The Examiner rejected claims 25, 26, 31, and 32 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda in view of Abe. The Examiner rejected claim 30 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda in view of Abe in further view of Ubillos. The Examiner has objected to claims 27-29 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but has said that they would be patentable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 27-29, but believes that independent claim 20, from which they depend, is patentable.

Claims 21-25 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 20, and are thus patentable for at least the reasons specified below with regard to claim 20. Claim 20, recites a graphical user interface ("GUI") method for specifying speed effects for a video presentation. The method, as part of the GUI, provides a GUI graph of a playback-time relative to a content time of the video presentation. The method allows a user to modify the graph by selecting a portion of the graph and performing a GUI drag operation.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kanda does not anticipate claim 20 because it does not provide every element of claim 20. For example, Kanda does not disclose, teach, or even suggest a graph that represents a playback-time relative to a content-time of a video clip, as claim 20 recites. The Office Action (in regard to claim 5) points to Kanda, Figure 13, item 25, as providing a graph representing the playback speed of the video clip. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the identified item is a graph representing playback speed. In fact, Kanda itself refers to item 25 as an area, not a graph. However, in any case, neither the identified item nor anything else in Kanda discloses, teaches, or even suggests a playback-time relative to a content-time, as claim 20 recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanda does not anticipate claim 20. As claims 21-32 are dependent, directly or indirectly on claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21-32 are patentable over Kanda for at least the same reasons that claim 20 is. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejections of claims 20-24, the rejections of claims 25, 26, and 30-32 under §103(a), and the objections to claims 27-29.

V. NEW CLAIMS 33-35

Applicant has added new claims, including claims 33-35. Claims 33-35 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 14 and are thus valid for at least the same reasons as claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 33-35 be allowed at the earliest possible date.

VI. NEW CLAIMS 36-40

Applicant has added new claims, including claims 36-40. Claims 36-40 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 20 and are thus valid for at least the same reasons as claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 36-40 be allowed at the earliest possible date.

VII. NEW CLAIMS 41-50

Applicant has added new claims, including claims 41-50. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 41-50 are supported by the specification and are valid over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 41-50 be allowed at the earliest possible date.

VIII. NEW CLAIMS 51-64

Applicant has added new claims, including claims 51-64. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 51-64 are supported by the specification and are valid over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 51-64 be allowed at the earliest possible date.

IX. NEW CLAIMS 65-67

Applicant has added new claims, including claims 65-67. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 65-67 are supported by the specification and are valid over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 65-67 be allowed at the earliest possible date.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all the claims, namely claims 1-67 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

ADELI LAW GROUP PLC

Dated: August 29, 2007

/Mani Adeli/

Adeli Law Group PLC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360
Century City, CA 90067-2514
Phone: (310) 785-0140
Fax: (310) 785-9558

Mani Adeli
Reg. No. 39,585